UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.       | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/662,125            | 09/12/2003                         | Gerd Moser           | 2058.226US1         | 9070             |
|                       | 7590 11/17/200<br>N, LUNDBERG & WO | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| P.O. BOX 2938         |                                    | DAILEY, THOMAS J     |                     |                  |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 |                                    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                       |                                    | 2452                 |                     |                  |
|                       |                                    |                      |                     |                  |
|                       |                                    |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                       |                                    | 11/17/2008           | PAPER               |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. |                  | Applicant(s) |  |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/662,125      |                  | MOSER ET AL. |  |
|                 | Examiner         | Art Unit     |  |
|                 | Thomas J. Dailey | 2452         |  |

| <del>-</del>  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|   | Thomas J. Dailey  | 2452   |   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add   | ress                                      |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 31 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A   |   | -  |   |  |  |  |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C   | the same day as filing a Notice of A<br>replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance               | Appeal. To avoid abai<br>t, or other evidence, v<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; o | which places the r (3) a Request          |  |  |  |
| periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing   | date of the final rejection  | on.                                       |  |  |  |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(   |   | TINOT NEI ET WAOTT   |   |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) | tension and the corresponding amount of<br>shortened statutory period for reply origing<br>than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropri-<br>nally set in the final Office               | ate extension fee<br>be action; or (2) as |  |  |  |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL  2.   ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 31 October 2008. A br  | iof in compliance with 27 CED 41.2  | 7 must be filed within   | two months of                             |  |  |  |
| the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply   | or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4  | 1.37(e)), to avoid disr  | nissal of the                             |  |  |  |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u>   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I  (a) They raise new issues that would require further col   | nsideration and/or search (see NOT  |  | ecause                                    |  |  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo   | •   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet</li><li>_ appeal; and/or</li></ul>  |   |  | he issues for                             |  |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a  | corresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.  |   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  |   | mpliant Amendment (  | PTOL-324).                                |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).   | ·   | •  | _   |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   | l be entered and an e  | xplanation of                             |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-50</u> .  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to conshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea   | ıl and/or appellant fail   | s to provide a                            |  |  |  |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio   |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |   | ing to botom or andom  | <b>-</b>                                  |  |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.  | t does NOT place the application in   | condition for allowan  | ce because:                               |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>5/21/2008</u>  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| 13. Other:  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|   | Manny Clint   |  |   |  |  |  |
| /Kenny S Lin/<br>Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452  |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|   | ,   |  |   |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Firstly, the issues in regards to the 1449 form filed 5/21/2008 have been resolved and the properly annotated 1449 form has been included herewith.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 1, 19, 20, 28, and 40-44 that Bodamer (US Pat. 6,236,997) fails to disclose "a master identifier" as recited in the claims.

The examiner disagrees. Bodamer discloses an integration server (column 5, lines 22-26, "heterogeneous services modules"), operative to: in response to a request from a client to access master data identified by a client identifier (column 7, lines 9-17 and column 8, lines 28-32; heterogeneous module receives client query identifying "user\_catalog@FDS" (e.g. a client identifier)), map the client identifier to a master identifier (column 8, lines 32-46, if the FDS does not have the table user\_catalog (e.g. a client identifier), but instead distributed metadata, that metadata is mapped to user\_catalog).

The metadata disclosed in Bodamer can be interpreted to include "a master identifier" as metadata is mapped to user\_catalog. Specifically, in the illustrative example disclosed in column 8, lines 47-67, the client statement is converted to a Sybase-compatible query. In the Sybase query, "from user\_catalog@link" from the original query is replaced with "from susers@link SU, sysobjects@link SO" (column 8, line 60).

Additionally, the applicant argues with respect to claim 39 and 43 that Mahajan (US Pat. 6,226,650) fails to disclose "placing the first client and clients who sent a set of characteristics that are the same as the first set of characteristics into a client group."

The examiner disagrees. Mahajan discloses placing the first client and clients who sent a set of characteristics that are the same as the first set of characteristics into a client group. (column 4, lines 15-23, if two clients have the same data requirements they will be in the same group in the sense they will have access to the same file groups. That is, when updates are distributed they are distributed to groups of clients and that update group reads on a client group).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is 571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday; 9:00am - 5:00pm.

•